

early part of next week, which we should not have to do but we will in order to finish the Nation's business. The time that we come back in December, if we come back in December—and I think that the Democratic leader and I have been very open that we have to plan on coming back for a short period of time, not knowing what we are going to be able to finish today, tomorrow, Saturday, and Monday, but in all likelihood we will have to come back for a couple of days in December, but that is not a time that we will be doing new legislation. I do not want anybody to think that if we do not do it now, we are going to be doing it in December because December will be to come in for as brief a period as possible to put the final touches on bills we cannot finish. So we have to finish the work right now.

I am going to make a brief statement on another issue but will turn to the Democratic issue on the schedule.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Just a question. If it is determined that we come back, it is my understanding it would not be until the 12th of December, at the earliest; is that the Senator's feelings at this time?

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, again, because it is so unclear to people, what we have said is it will not be before December 12. It will not necessarily be on the 12th either but during that week. I think all of our Members—because there are a lot of travel plans that have been made and people are going back to their States and overseas, we are going to have to keep that week flexible, but it would be the intention to come back as late in that week as possible, in large part because we are waiting for the House to catch up—that is the way I think of it in my own mind—to catch up with legislation. I think that we need to keep flexible. My intention is not to bring people back for an entire week.

Again, on scheduling, the Democratic leader and I talk about it every day, so we will keep people posted, again recognizing the importance of that time to be spent with constituents, family, and overseas.

#### GETTING THE JOB DONE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, there is a lot going on in Washington. The environment seems to be very partisan. When we look at the newspapers, we see the comments that have been made back and forth, but I have to take a couple of minutes and restate what I have mentioned and implied over the last several days; that in spite of all of that, in spite of the vitriolic comments that are being made, the Senate, this institution, is doing its work. It is governing in a way in which I think we can all be proud. If we look over the last 48 hours, one will see how our overall agenda of renewal and reform is being accomplished. We have had sev-

eral legislative advances that do make America safer and more prosperous. As I mentioned, we will be continuing our work through today, tomorrow, and possibly Saturday, delivering these meaningful solutions to the real challenges and real problems that everyday people are having across this great country. It is important for people to be reminded of that.

I think of four things that have been started in the last 48 hours: The Defense authorization bill, a very important bill that we spent a good amount of time on with a lot of amendments, but ultimately it underscored our absolute commitment to our troops overseas and to the goals that have been set out by this administration. So I am very proud that we did pass that bill. It gives our soldiers the resources, the training, the technology and the support they deserve and that they absolutely need to win the global war on terror. I refer to it occasionally—I actually put it on my Web site on the front page, the Zawahiri and Zarqawi letter which outlines what the intentions are of al-Qaida in this war on terror. The appropriate responsiveness of this body in this Department of Defense authorization bill speaks very importantly to the response that we need to give to these challenges. From cutting-edge technologies to the personnel protection systems, the bill keeps our military strong so that we absolutely will win this war against terror.

We made the clear-cut statement in this bill that America is not going to cut and run, as some would have us do; that we are going to support and continue to train the Iraqi forces until they are strong enough to fight on their own. Also, we expressed our absolute support for this President and his policies through this bill.

The second issue, along with defending our national security, we are strengthening America's retirement security. Ten days ago, people said there is no way this pensions bill is going to get through the Senate. Yet yesterday we passed it, and it spoke very loudly to the fact that the defined pensions benefit system is a ticking timebomb, that over 44 million Americans who are legally covered by the American Government's guarantee are in jeopardy of losing their hard-earned retirement benefits. This bill makes it clear that promises made by employers are promises to be kept to their employees. So we passed that bill yesterday, again a major step forward.

The third area, the vital function of Government. Yesterday, we passed the Commerce-Justice-Science appropriations bill. Along with funding these Federal agencies, the CJS bill includes significant Katrina-related responses. As we all know, more than 350,000 families have been made homeless by the Katrina disaster. A number of us have participated over the course of this past week in a Habitat for Humanity bill project at the Capitol. It reminded

me how important it is to marry the nonprofit sector, with the nongovernmental organizations, with what we on this floor have done in response to Katrina and the natural disasters that have struck both this country but indeed around the world. That CJS appropriations bill, in part, reflects the public response in that it provides Federal housing assistance for up to \$600 per family per month for up to 6 months to help get those families back on their feet.

This body continues and will continue with its commitment to assist this renewal and recovery from one of, if not the greatest, natural disasters this country has ever seen.

Looking a little more globally, another bill that was passed last night that reflects America's compassion for neighbors around the world was a bill that means a lot to me personally. It is a bipartisan bill in this body called the Water for the Poor Act. This bill addresses the issue that 1.2 billion people in this world do not have access to what we have sitting on our desk as we are here speaking—clean water. Mr. President, 1.2 billion people do not have access to water they can look at and say it does not have bacteria or viruses in it that will make me ill.

The lack of clean water kills more kids under the age of 6 than any disease in the world today, although most people don't pay a lot of attention to it, so this body passed a bill last night that addresses that, the Water for the Poor Act. We had bipartisan legislation on the floor of the Senate sponsored by myself and the Democratic leader upon which this bill is based. It establishes for the first time as a part of our foreign policy the development of water interests as we consider foreign development aid, this whole provision of safe, clean, renewable water for poor countries. It recognizes that unsafe water in developing countries kills a child every 15 seconds. Every 15 seconds a child dies because of lack of access to that clean water. It contributes to poverty, it contributes to unstable governments, and thus the importance of having clean water be a part of our foreign policy, foreign development assistance to these countries.

In combination with the \$200 million recently enacted for safe water in developing countries, this is a critical first step in beginning to solve what is a seemingly insurmountable problem but is a solvable problem. It looks at compassion, it looks at protection, it looks at accountability, all of which must be injected in our foreign policy when it comes to foreign aid.

One last issue. In terms of progress made over the last 40 hours, the Banking Committee reported Tuesday the nomination of Ben Bernanke to succeed Alan Greenspan as the next chairman of the Federal Reserve. I am pleased the committee has acted on Mr. Bernanke's nomination and that he has pledged to maintain the Federal Reserve's statutory independence while

also maintaining stable, pro-growth monetary policies.

Chairman Greenspan's 18 years of service will not officially end until the end of January. Therefore, the full Senate will confirm Mr. Bernanke as one of its first actions beginning the second session of the 109th Congress.

I have run through those five—I said four but five—legislative successes that do demonstrate this body continues to move along, responding to the needs and appropriate desires of the American people. At the beginning of the year we set big goals and every day on this floor we are working hard to meet them, and again we are being successful meeting each one of these benchmarks.

Yes, we have had Katrina, we have had Rita, we have had the natural disasters—the tsunami in Pakistan, we have consistently supported our troops overseas, and in addition we are addressing the issues that, domestically, are on the minds of the American people. I look forward to completing our work this week. It is one of the reasons I outlined a few minutes ago the things we have to do before we leave for our Thanksgiving recess. When we do return to our States, there will be a lot we can point back to, responding to the needs of the American people, and we will be absolutely comfortable in looking them in the eye and saying, yes, we are delivering meaningful solutions to your, the American people's, everyday challenges. Together we are moving America forward.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Will the Chair advise the Senate with regard to the allocation of time at this point?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised there is 30 minutes on each side. The first half of the half hour is under the control of the minority leader or his designee.

I am corrected. It is 30 minutes, with the first 15 minutes under the control of the minority leader.

Mr. WARNER. Would it be appropriate, then, for the Senator from Virginia to seek time at this point for about 8 minutes?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is under the control of the minority for the first 15 minutes.

Mr. WARNER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

#### EPA ANALYSIS OF CLEAN AIR LEGISLATION

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I will take some time this morning to talk about why we need new clean air legislation. It has been some 15 years since Congress passed the last revisions to the Clean Air Act. No one disputes the fact that we have made significant environmental progress since that time, but our work is not over. Powerplants continue to blow pollution that causes smog and other air problems in our cities and our communities. Unless we re-

quire powerplants everywhere to reduce the amount of pollution they emit, we will continue to be faced with poor air quality and its dangerous side effects.

The idea of reducing pollution from powerplants is not new. We have been discussing it for years. In fact, when President Bush first ran for the White House, he promised, in 2000, to make new clean air legislation one of his top environmental priorities. Since I came to the Senate in 2001, we have seen a number of proposals on how to proceed. Senator JEFFORDS offered his Clean Power Act. The President offered his Clear Skies Act. I, along with Senators CHAFEE, GREGG, and ALEXANDER, offered a proposal that we call the Clean Air Planning Act.

I have always believed that our proposal, the third proposal, is the right one. While I agree with the principles laid out in the bill by Senator JEFFORDS, I fear it will be too costly and its goals technologically unachievable. By contrast, the President's plan is too weak and would do nothing to reduce our emissions of carbon dioxide, which we believe contributes to global warming.

What we crafted in response to these two proposals was a middle-ground approach, one that achieved the objectives of the Jeffords bill without relying on the command and control philosophies of the past. It is an approach that reduces pollution further and faster than the President has visualized, while giving utilities the flexibilities they need and the incentives they need to get the job done right.

Since we first introduced that bill some 3 years ago, I have tried to get the EPA to conduct an objective scientific analysis of it and how it compares with other proposals. We were repeatedly denied. Earlier this year, the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee tried to push through the President's Clear Skies bill. I again asked for an analysis of our proposal and the other proposals, and we were denied. The administration told me I had all the information I needed and there was no reason to further debate it. I told them without that information we could not negotiate. On March 8, Clear Skies was voted on in our committee and it failed on a 9-to-9 vote.

Soon after the failure to pass out Clear Skies, President Bush nominated Stephen Johnson to be the new head of EPA. Stephen Johnson had impeccable credentials stemming from his long, distinguished career within the agency. In essence, Mr. JOHNSON represented the best person for the job. But when he came before our committee to have his nomination approved, I voted against him. I think I was the only one. Then I placed a hold on his nomination, something I have never done in my 5 years in the Senate. I don't have a problem with Stephen Johnson; I had a problem with the way the administration was politicizing EPA and keeping the agency from doing its job in

providing the information that I and others were requesting.

I believe we need this information in order to enable us to craft the best possible clean air bill. I didn't think it was too much to ask that we have a detailed, up-to-date modeling on how our bills would affect the economy, the health of our public, and our environment. My hold was eventually overridden, I think by two votes. But to my surprise, my pleasant surprise, once Stephen Johnson became administrator, he offered to model the economic, the health, and the environmental impact of the various clean air proposals.

I say right now on the floor that I very much appreciate Stephen Johnson's willingness to grant my request. It says a lot about what kind of man he is, and that he is willing to break through the logjam in trying to meet our years-long request.

Last month, on October 27, Stephen Johnson and some of his senior leadership from EPA delivered the analysis they have done. It is my hope their analysis from EPA will take the debate that has been going on for a number of years to the next level.

After reviewing the details of the analysis, it clearly shows, perhaps ironically, that we can do better than the President's Clear Skies plan. In fact, it shows we can get much better environmental and health benefits than Clear Skies at only a slightly higher cost.

On the issue of climate change, the analysis shows we can regulate carbon dioxide cheaply and without worrying that we will hurt coal production or drive up natural gas prices. Let me explain, using a few charts from the EPA analysis.

The first chart, "Projected Emissions From Electric Generating Units"—there are four of them. The first we will look at is sulfur dioxide emissions from electric generators. We have three proposals we can actually see. This yellow-golden line is a proposal called the Clean Power Act offered by Senator JEFFORDS. This line here is actually several lines that overlap, but it is Clear Skies and current law, the President's proposal. The green line here is the Clean Air Planning Act that Senators CHAFEE, ALEXANDER, GREGG, and I had offered. This is 2005. This is where we are right now.

If the legislation were adopted, you see a spike in sulfur dioxide emission from the Jeffords proposal. Then it drops down lower than the others.

What you see here with sulfur dioxide emissions—the President's proposal is the same as current law.

What you see here for the bipartisan proposal the other three Republicans and I offered is something that gets us deeper cuts in sulfur dioxide emissions, far deeper than the proposal of the administration, and far deeper than that of current law, and eventually somewhere in between where the Jeffords bill is and where the President's proposal is.